

Forest Health Strategy Work Group

October 13th & 14th, 2004: Sixth Meeting
Ramada Inn Airport, Washington Room
Spokane, Washington

Members Present:

Pat McElroy, Chair, DNR Staff
Karen Ripley, Coordinator, DNR Staff
Vicki Lee, Secretary/Meeting Minutes, DNR Staff
Rich Fonda, Fire Ecologist, WWU
Maurice Williamson, Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee
Mike Petersen, The Lands Council
Rick Brazell, USDA Forest Service
Bruce Lippke, UW College of Forest Resources
Peter Heide, Washington State Society of American Foresters
John Mankowski, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (**Attended only October 13th**)
Steve Tveit, Boise Cascade
Bob Gara, Forest Entomologist, UW College of Forest Resources
Barry Moore, WSU Department of Natural Resource Science (**Attended only October 14th**)

Absent:

Ron Shultz, Executive Policy Advisor, Governor's Executive Policy Office
John St. Pierre, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Mike Blankenship, Ferry County Commissioner

Guests:

Elaine Oneil, UW College of Forest Resources
Howard Thronson, Product, Sales and Leasing Manager – DNR, State Lands
Vic Moon, Senior Research Analyst – Senate Natural Resources Committee
Steve Saunders, Environmental & Legal Strategies Section Mgr. - Asset Mgmt. Protection Div.
Neil Beaver, Legislative Assistant to Senator Lisa Brown

DAY 1

CALL TO ORDER:

Pat McElroy called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. McElroy introduced Vic Moon and Steve Saunders to the Committee. McElroy advised that Moon, Senior Research Analyst from the Senate Natural Resources Committee would be taking the information we have been working on and putting it into Bill language; and Saunders would be the facilitator for the next two days. Everyone introduced themselves. McElroy made a motion to review and approve the minutes from the September 15th meeting; minutes were approved. (Later, Bruce Lippke brought to Vicki Lee a few minor changes to the presentation he gave last month) **Action: Vicki will make the changes to the minutes. A revised version will be posted on the Internet.** Steve Saunders went over the agenda, advising what needed to be accomplished in the next two-days.

Brief Status: Forest Health Data Requirements – Maurice Williamson, Bruce Lippke, and Peter Heide

Bruce Lippke pointed out that this was the same subject as listed at 2:30 p.m. today. Basically they did a little research intending the committee would come together and evaluate the information. Lippke stated they have a sketch of what the issues are, but have not had the time to deliberate yet. **Topic will be revisited this afternoon.**

McElroy commented on what a great job everyone had done on their tasks. It was remarkable to see the work that has been accomplished, and the high quality products coming forward.

McElroy added that he has contacted DNR's Technical Writing Staff. When we are finished one of our editors will unify the different writing styles.

Rich Fonda urged all writers to include a comma prior to "and" at the conclusion of a list. **Fonda suggested on the document Tasks c and b, October 04 draft, on the first page, line 8, that a comma be put after wind.**

Task d: Developing a Strategic Plan – Pat McElroy and Karen Ripley

McElroy advised following the August meeting he worked on the Outline, and took materials from other sources that had been worked on and formed what a Strategic Plan should look like.

McElroy went over the draft then asked if there were any comments, additions or deletions.

Results are in red.

Page 1, Line 22, added after catastrophic fire, **and insect and disease outbreaks (will lead to item 21 as outcome).**

McElroy: Page 1, Line 23, added after watershed function, **(quantity and sustained abundance of water in addition to function).** This will need more fleshing out after Barry Moore's presentation tomorrow.

Fonda: Page 1, Line 25, after Sustain add, **fish and** wildlife habitat

(Include insects and diseases in Line 21, 22, or 26)

Page 1, Line 35, should read, **Data/Information:**

Page 1, Line 38, include after DNR, **(the state)**

Page 1, Line 42, after Parks, add, **Fish and Wildlife areas**

Page 2, between Identify Program Components and Incentives, add a section for, **Economic Considerations**, under that section add **Markets, and Non-market values.**

Page 2, Line 16, after FEDERAL LANDS add **(not just National Forest system, includes National Parks and Refuge areas, etc).**

It was asked, what the relationship is between the members' assignments, the Committee's assignment, and the Strategic Plan.

McElroy reminded the Committee that one of the charges assigned is to assist the Commissioner of Public Lands on the preparation of the Strategic Plan. It's the Department's job to put the Strategic Plan together; therefore, assistance is needed from the Committee on fleshing this out. McElroy asked the members of the Committee to think about this Strategic Plan, and if we need to come back to this from time to time, and say that we forgot this, or take that out, or add this, then we will do so. Basically DNR is going to integrate the Committee's work into the Strategic Plan.

1 Karen Ripley advised that two reports would need to go to the legislature on December 30th.
2 They will need to be separate but compatible reports. Ripley said the document she put together
3 (to be discussed tomorrow) is the background framework for all of your report sections. This will
4 be the group report.

5
6 Vic Moon commented that he and legislative members were looking forward to the Strategic Plan
7 and Work Group Report; and will want to read them before the legislative session.

8
9 **Task a & h: Determine whether the goals and requirements of RCW 76.06 are being met,
10 and analyze the state noxious weed control statutes and extreme hazard regulations to see if
11 they could serve as a model – Karen Ripley, Ron Shultz, and Bob Gara**

12 Ripley stated the Committee really didn't get a chance to provide much input. The draft was put
13 together mainly from past discussions. The group proceeded to add comments, additions and
14 deletions. **Changes are in red.**

15
16 Page 1, Lines 11-15, is inconsistent, AWKWARD

17
18 McElroy: Page 1, Line 14, after significant, add **native**

19 Page 1, Line 22, after feasibility, (**enlarge on this**), after lack of add **ability to comply with permit**
20 **requirements of**, and **cross out compliance with**

21 Page 1, Line 27, should read, **An effective**, **cross out A desirable**

22 Page 1, Line 28, add, **regulatory**, before government

23 Page 1, Line 29, **cross out DNR's**, and insert, **The State's (this should include counties and other**
24 **local governments)**

25 Page 1, Line 31, **cross out in a way**, and add, **to reduce the susceptibility and vulnerability**, and
26 **cross out to reduce vulnerability**

27 Page 2, Line 2, after order to, add **better identify and rate stand conditions**,

28 Page 2, Line 3, after lands, adds **Incentives may be required to achieve a satisfactory response on**
29 **some lands. NOTE: Need to be able to say, "Here's where the money needs to go."** Caution:
30 are there data gaps? Present information all comes up short for moving forward. Need better
31 numbers to describe healthy forest as well as at-risk forest conditions and locations, especially to
32 detail need to have an enforcement program. Could also define a process for resolving data
33 gaps/conflicting opinions/integrating new material, landowner objectives, etc. (Bin: stick to
34 principles of what set up situation...save for general introduction).

35 Gara: Page 2, Line 11, **cross out included** and replace with **include: 1) Clear statements are the**
36 **responsibility of the landowner to control noxious weeds; 2) Concept of a landowner is the**
37 **responsibility to control the pest; 3) Local control given to counties to enhance the assessment**
38 **control of specific weeds; and 4) The ability of landowners to negotiate a plan to achieve**
39 **compliance over a period of years.**

40
41 These legal principles work well.

42
43 Heide is not convinced that forest landowners are as cohesive a community as agricultural
44 landowners.

45
46 Not a good template for native insects and diseases because of variety of landowner objectives.
47 Would cut capacity to look at other forest health (soils, etc.) 6144 tells us to look at trees.
48 Discharge of landowner responsibility has not been discussed. County role issue has not been
49 discussed. Most management regulations have been retained within the state. Committee needs
50 to vote on whether we like this structure. It is appropriate for Tier 3? Could we re-cast what we
51 think is good in noxious weed (NW) law in Tier 1 and 2?

1 Heide: Mimic RCW 76.04 more closely? Select attributes of NW law we like. Include local
2 control. Don't specify that county government is the role.

3
4 Karl Denison: NW laws haven't worked well on forestlands where under funded.... Westside

5
6 Mike Petersen: Would also be difficult when there are diverse objectives and standards.
7 (Do counties have a role in Forest Health?)

8
9 Leave prescriptive nature of NW law open for now, but don't leave this meeting without an
10 answer. Compromise: 3-Tier approach...Lines 5-17 only, or best relate to Tier 3. Committee
11 needs to vote.

12
13 Need to describe that we looked at those statutes. Part of direct charge
14 BUT, the most effective forest health bill will be Tiered concept

15 Put Lines 5-17 at the end, so don't distract from Tiers. How Tiers relate to task to evaluate NW
16 and extreme hazard law

17
18 Page 2, after Line 17, add 76.06 provides a mechanism that is already closely related to forestry
19 and forest management standards

20
21 We have not discussed issues of civil liability: If adjacent landowner has 17 trees that die and he
22 wants to be litigious, are we opening people up to frivolous action from their neighbors?
23 Potential unintended consequences?

24
25 It's one thing to say the landowner has responsibility to prevent or abate hazards, say "because it
26 has the potential to impact adjacent landowners."

27
28 Add meat to assessment of the two laws.

29
30 Page 2, Line 22, after self-treatment, add (what is self-treatment? "Landowners can handle their
31 own problems" or delete the phrase).

32
33 Page 2, Line 29 after losses, add Some incentives may be necessary for small landowners.

34
35 What is the goal we are trying to achieve at Tier 1 level? Avoid insect and disease problems.
36 Describe it as a "prevention" approach. Tier it back into primary objectives "reducing a
37 significant insect and disease threats", or use terminology in Page 1, Line 26 of Strategic Plan
38 Outline.

39
40 Education is important to identify here in order to avoid significant insect and disease threats.
41 (Implement via expansion of current coached planning to emphasize forest health. State that you
42 will alter the emphasis in coached planning classes).

43
44 Robert Gara: Before DNR, Line 23, insert: In cooperative efforts, DNR and landowners would
45 monitor forest conditions that are prone to insect and disease outbreaks.

46
47 McElroy: different processes: 1) broad overview of aerial survey flights conducted by DNR and
48 Forest Service; 2) Landowners assess own land at very micro level (need training from DNR and
49 others to be able to do so). (Put it into two different paragraphs). The macro and micro level also
50 have to be elaborated on in data gaps. The top-down stuff is not specific enough to manage lands
51 or enable enforcement.

1 Monitoring is an important element here.

2 Don't ignore large private landowners...minor word changes..."Landowner should be provided
3 with advice (not "access" advice) and obtain technical assistance from researchers, private
4 forestry consultants and stewardship foresters"

6 Desired outcomes of strategic plan (Line 21-27)...do they collectively define Tier 1? Will having
7 a goal for Tier 1 clarify this? "Forests are managed in ways that create, restore, or maintain
8 forests that maintain native forest insects and diseases at endemic, non-destructive levels."

10 Overview flights are part of Tier 1.

12 Tier 1 is just good forest management.

14 Page 2, Line 22, after cooperatively, add: Incentives may be required to achieve a satisfactory
15 response on some lands.

17 Needs a goal statement that ties back to strategic plan. Take parenthetical statement out of
18 parentheses.

20 Is there more than one level of risk between the Tier 2 and 3? Biologically – no. Regulatory –
21 yes.

23 Need something to identify when regulatory action can be taken. There must be a trigger.

25 Tier 2 needs some focused action: Tier 3 needs to be able to say, "If some action is not taken then
26 damage will occur on adjacent lands." (There is a biological distinction). What kind of language
27 should be used to distinguish Tier 2 and 3? How large of an area triggers it?

29 What is the scale that would trigger Tier 2/3?

31 Tier 2 goal: Through voluntary effort to contain outbreaks of FID and avoid extreme forest
32 health hazard.

34 Tier 3: When FID pose a significant imminent threat, then there is a required treatment protocol
35 defined by the Commissioner and advisory committee/technical experts. There is a biological
36 difference between Tier 2 and Tier 3, because significant threat has really escalated, response
37 must be more aggressive. Should the Commissioner have an advisory panel on all three levels?

39 Tier 2: Group of people acknowledges that an I&D situation has escalated. Advice given. All
40 still voluntary.

42 Tier 3 is a legal mandate. I&D situation threatens neighboring lands and public resources.

44 Would it be useful to describe a case of how these tiers would have worked with Spruce
45 budworm or Douglas-fir beetle case study? Use it as a benchmark. Use it for drafting legislation.

47 Make all parallel. Should have a goal, biological conditions that exist, and legal authority or
48 prescriptive measures.

50 Can we give the legislature a sense of how much is in each tier? Especially Tier 1 vs. Tier 2

1 Tier 1 deals a lot with education and extension. Tier 2 is an expression of a problem. Tier 3 is a
2 legal aspect. All three of these elements need to be discussed for each Tier.

3
4 Need to tie this back to fire. Page 3, Line 2: “Vegetative condition likely to produce...” This says
5 “Fire”. Page 2, Line 16 says “prevent or abate hazards”. Fire hazards occur naturally. We’ve
6 considered NW and I&D hazard law...Landowner has to do something regardless of how hazard
7 occurred. BUT he urges that Extreme hazard law be adjusted so that regardless of how fire
8 hazard got there, enforcement can be required. Need to say that there is a change necessary to
9 RCW 76.04. Need to vote before we leave this meeting. Also, consider fire hazard in each of the
10 goal statements.

11
12 Heide agrees. Do nothing but fight fire is not a natural condition. Heide added, also need to state
13 what the state’s responsibility is in each of these three steps.

14
15 Moon commented that in Tier 3, Line 23-29, “that’s the hammer”. Legislators want a strong
16 hammer.

17
18 What is the trigger that for extra-ordinary state powers?

19
20 **Task c: Identify opportunities and barriers for improved prevention of losses of public and**
21 **private resources to forest insects, diseases, wind, and fire: Task b: Study what incentives**
22 **could be used to assist landowners with the costs of creating and maintaining forest health.**
23 **– Bruce Lippke, Mike Petersen, Maurice Williamson, and Steve Tveit**

24 McElroy gave an editorial comment: A non-industrial forest landowner vs. family forest owner
25 these terms are objectionable. Prefers “large” and “small” landowners. Need to be consistent.
26 Need to be mindful.

27
28 Fonda explained the railroads classified according to annual income from the railroad. Could we
29 use this model?

30
31 McElroy relayed that Forests and Fish distinguishes owners by harvesting 2 million bf per year;
32 there is a 5,000-acre break for some things.

33
34 Maurice Williamson is satisfied with “large” and “small”

35
36 Heide maintains that there is a need to differentiate, because some will get more of different types
37 of services and enforcement than others.

38
39 Mankowski added, Forest and Fish distinction of large and small relates to the funding of the fish
40 passage program. Look at the report with respect to why/if we need to distinguish or characterize
41 the landowners.

42
43 Fonda asked, “Are we just identifying the opportunities and barriers or actually telling the
44 Legislature to fix these?”

45
46 Lippke replied that we are using this as a guide for the elements that must be done.

47
48 Saunders commented that we could use a table to track where things are addressed.

1 Heide agreed with Saunders. Heide referred to Page 1, Line 13, and said to be sure we are always
2 referring to overstocked *forest* conditions. Species and stocking are also important. It shows up
3 on Page 1 Line 20.

4
5 Petersen suggested taking out reference to overstocking because it isn't the only cause.

6
7 Williamson disagreed, and said to leave it in. Add other problems that we can fix.

8
9 Mankowski says it's a multitude of problems.

10
11 Fonda stated we need different solutions; understory vs. overstory.

12
13 Lippke agreed with Petersen.

14
15 Gara liked it. It's a good indicator of what's been going on in the forest for many years.

16
17 Mankowski pointed out forest health problems are widespread, they are mostly on the eastside,
18 and a result of many causes.

19
20 McElroy suggested to take out "because of" on Page 1, Line 12, and replace it with
21 "*demonstrated by*".

22
23 Williamson suggested adding on Page 1, Line 24; add "*parcelization*" or "*landownership*
24 *patterns*" after exposure.

25
26 Petersen added on Page 1 Line 24 after Williamson's addition, add: *because large landowners*
27 *have more opportunities to do prescribed fire safely,*

28
29 Williamson said sentence on Page 1, Line 26 and 27, is not well understood.

30
31 Lippke said use of prescribed fire is not sustainable economically. Need to make it clear.

32
33 Howard Thronson observed that the first two sentences on Page 1, Line 20, are about natural fire.
34 We need to separate normal fire and management practices from prescribed fire.

35
36 Fonda suggested on Page 1, Line 20, to use "*Fire exclusion*", not fire suppression. Fonda also
37 added a table would help organize the opportunities and barriers to clarify the message.

38
39 Williamson asked on Page 2, Line 8-13, "Are we going to illustrate this?"

40
41 Fonda asked if we could include appendixes that would do this? **Answer: Yes.**

42
43 Mankowski is concerned that it is not a real concern, on Page 2, Lines 17-23. It didn't come up
44 in review of laws as they were written and hasn't come up to Forest Practices Board. Is this
45 based on modeling, or is it a concern to raise?

46
47 Lippke replied that the modeling does show it, and at least three people testified to our group that
48 it does.

49
50 Gara pointed out that it does in the western spruce budworm case.

1 **Action: McElroy will go out in the field with Forest Practices and investigate further at the**
2 **end of October.**

3
4 Tveit explained that surveys of eastside landowners indicate that riparian rules are complex,
5 resulting in absence of management. That wasn't the goal.

6
7 Mankowski asked, "Isn't there enough work on uplands and side slopes to stay busy with all our
8 capacity?"

9
10 Heide commented that a problem has been identified, but he doesn't want to use this report as a
11 frontal attack on forest practices. Suggests referring the problem back to CMER and Forest
12 Practices Board for consideration.

13
14 Elaine Oneil suggested having an informal conversation with the bull trout groups. They have
15 really been doing good management in Leavenworth. We need funding to support re-entry into
16 riparian areas.

17
18 Gara stated riparian areas are not a big question, except when a case of insect outbreak occurs.
19 Need case-specific assessment.

20
21 Williamson agreed that it was ok to soften the language, but from a small landowner perspective.
22 Alternate plan process is too cumbersome. Legislation will help. It does need definite, quick
23 attention. Don't trash Forest and Fish.

24
25 Mankowski suggested using the concept of Tiers 2 And 3. Could there be expedited permits and
26 alternate planning when there are real problems to tackle?

27
28 Williamson suggested on Page 3, Line 1, to include other governments: "Federal, State, and
29 Local"

30
31 Rick Brazell said to add "and tribes", after agencies on Page 3, Line 21.

32
33 Williamson said this would be really helpful. If you sell even one tree you have to go through the
34 process on a \$70 fee. This ticks off a lot of landowners.

35 36 **Education and Technical Assistance**

37 Heide emphasized this section needs to include a strong, simple statement about what it is we
38 want to educate these landowners about, and how they can achieve it.

39
40 Lippke asked if this wasn't in another section.

41
42 Heide suggested putting generic language in the first and second paragraph.

43
44 Williamson really liked Page 5, Line 11. "The immediate need is to"

45
46 Petersen stated there needs to be a mechanism or a more aggressive way to get more funding to
47 reach more landowners. The traditional mailing and workshop invitations don't reach enough/all
48 of the landowners. He suggested going door-to-door. Petersen described a program they had in
49 Montana that was pretty successful. A payment of \$100 per family was provided to Fire Districts
50 made to make a house visit, do an assessment, and discuss the issues.

1 McElroy suggested adding a generalized statement to Page 5, Line 22, such as: to explore other
2 avenues and opportunities....

3
4 Saunders reminded the members that it could be attached as an addendum.

5
6 McElroy asked if the statement about private industry (Page 5, Line 17) was appropriate, or
7 sufficient.

8
9 Thronson asked, “Why separate Public and Private lands?”

10
11 Lippke replied that the private lands’ situation is very different from federal lands. Don’t want to
12 collapse groups.

13
14 Heide stated we should to flesh out ideas more.

15
16 Mankowski asked, “What is suite of forest health threats?”

17
18 Heide said Page 5; Line 17 paragraph needs more attention.

19
20 McElroy pointed out that we needed to include tribal lands, even though BIA is mentioned in
21 “Public Lands” paragraph.

22
23 This section really focuses on non-industrial assistance. Does that mean that they are the problem
24 and major place for solutions? State that the problem is evenly spread across ownerships (if it is).
25 Make Page 4; Line 1 vulnerability more global. Describe why non-industrial needs special
26 attention. Generalize introduction to Education Section; move non-industrial to a lower position.

27
28 Williamson commented that we need to emphasize that there’s less staff now than there was 10-
29 years ago. It’s covered, but should be brought out.

30
31 Denison indicated that the generalization at the beginning should also include education of
32 general public at large to generate acceptance for treatment actions. The Forest Service has a
33 department that does this. Smokey worked. NRCEES and grants to DNR deliver education via
34 federal funding. Include ad councils and national ad campaigns. Address kids in schools through
35 environmental education. New interagency environmental education committee may be an
36 opportunity.

37 38 **INCENTIVE PROGRAMS**

39 Williamson suggested tax credits for individuals as an incentive. Also on Line 30; Page 6 on
40 comparative bidding, Williamson added that agricultural program are consistent. Forest
41 landowners don’t deal with the cost share programs enough; another layer of uncertainty through
42 bidding process is not desirable.

43
44 Ripley asked Steve Gibbs about the FLEP Program and the Cost Share Program in regards to
45 competitive bidding, and he isn’t in favor of it. It sounds like a great idea; but is very difficult to
46 implement.

47
48 McElroy emphasized not to eliminate it because the goal is to achieve economic efficiency. If it
49 works, it’s really a success. The concept is legitimate; keep it in. “Look at ways to achieve
50 maximum economic efficiency of the dollars spent.”

1 Denison asked about the haul cost concept.

2
3 Lippke replied it was already implied.

4
5 Williamson added that small landowners are limited to cash on hand, and we need to keep that in
6 mind.

7
8 Saunders commented that it sounds like there are a lot of barriers to offering some incentives.

9
10 Petersen said regarding the riparian discussion, we might want to take a look at Page 6, Lines 8-
11 20. Eastside riparian rules: “the way people are applying these rules may be leading to
12 undesirable conditions.”

13
14 Mankowski pointed out that the Forest Practice Board and Research Committee need to look at
15 the issues and address them.

16
17 McElroy pointed out that we are in a holding pattern until we hear Steve Tveit’s presentation this
18 afternoon.

19
20 Oneil added that we should also add a section on Tribal Lands.

21 22 **Non-Industrial Forest Lands**

23 Page 6; Line 1 (Terminology check for landowner category)

24 25 **Private Industry Lands**

26 Be sure to include that missing infrastructure is a barrier.

27
28 Large landowners will respond to cooperative atmosphere show up, and participate, if state
29 forestry or agency leadership suggests that x, y, and z things need to be done. If recognition is
30 given, then large landowners will respond.

31
32 TFW groups are good targets for educational information and incentives. They are good groups
33 that are still working, but it’s hard to attend and participate. Environmental groups may have
34 dropped out in some areas. Some aren’t as cooperative as they used to be. Also, consider
35 agencies for salmon recovery.

36 37 **Community Group Support**

38 Williamson commented that Page 9, Line 9 and 10 is a broad statement. Describe what we really
39 are talking about. Local chapters of WFFA for small forest landowner issues? Are there FLACs
40 and RACs? Is there a Resource Advisory Committee? Each National forest has one for federal
41 issues. We should provide some “such as...” Are there statutes associated with FLACs and
42 RACs that can be used? Especially PACs, agency RAC or eastern Washington RAC could be
43 utilized. Don’t just create new.

44 45 **Cost of Incentive Programs**

46 If you are doing enforcement in Tier 3 to generate funds, you are entering into costs of a
47 monitoring system. Monitoring through remote sensing?
48 Is prescribed fire a phase of treatment? It’s needed every 20 years...there’s no future revenue
49 generation because it wipes out your tree regeneration. How do we do this and protect the
50 regeneration? The smoke management rules are a huge barrier (that will likely remain a solid
51 barrier). It’s not a useful solution on a broad landscape scale.

1 Denison stated that the Forest Service accomplished 26,000 acres of prescribed burning this year.

2
3 Should we put a statement in that says, “If periodic prescribed fire is not possible, then the
4 success of this plan is jeopardized and it must be understood that it will not be fully achieved.”

5
6 The way the Clean Air Act is implemented in Washington is a huge barrier. Is there a way to
7 change the standards? **Make a recommendation for legislature to consider.** It isn’t the particulate
8 cap that is the barrier; it’s the daily permission that’s the problem. It’s the implementation of
9 “statewide” Smoke Management Plan and the “state” implementation of the National Clean Air
10 Act that’s a problem.

11 12 **Community Wildfire Planning**

13 Heide commented that we have federal dollars to flow into urban environment. He asked if some
14 would come to more general forestland?

15
16 Ripley replied, “Yes, bark beetle/prevention is a new grant program that is currently available,
17 but is unstable from year to year”.

18
19 Petersen asked if Fire Plan dollars are to go to municipal watersheds, and if a community defines
20 a larger area then that is it ok for the dollars that are available for WUI?

21
22 McElroy advised there are three sources of dollars: 1) biggest amount of funding (60 percent) is
23 for fuels on federal land, 2) states apply for federal grants to reduce community exposure to fire,
24 and 3) bark beetle dollars through forest health protection and state.

25
26 Heide asked if community definition were expanded to “community of forest landowners” not
27 just residential community concept, could we bring some dollars to the forestland?

28
29 Petersen replied that there was a definition (one structure per 40 acres, etc).

30
31 McElroy stated there is congruence with forest areas that are at risk.

32
33 Example: The Ahtanum won’t meet definition because people don’t live there. But forest
34 landowners should work as a group.

35
36 There is a New Tribal Forestry Relations Act, whereby tribes can petition Forest Service to
37 actively treat areas that are important to them.

38
39 Fonda asked if the language on Page 10 and 11 is lifted from federal guidelines. **Answer: Yes.**

40
41 McElroy reminded members to be mindful to make sure report ties in tightly to forest health.

42
43 Add on Page 10, Line 16 before an opportunity; **will there be federal dollars to flow into areas**
44 **away?**

45 46 **Increasing Interagency Coordination**

47 Page 11, Lines 19-21 **integrate with Task F.**

48 In education and technical assistance sections, there are references to adequately trained people.
49 Must be sure that correct advice is also given. Need registration, or license, or certification
50 process. Need to provide training. Need to follow and monitor, and discipline people too. Make

1 demand to SAF to provide a specialty certification. We can use words like, “adequately trained”,
2 and stress accountability in barriers.

3
4 **Task e: Develop funding alternatives for consideration by the legislative – Peter Heide,**
5 **Mark Gray (DNR), and Mike Blankenship**

6 Heide explained his draft was written in a very general way. That there are three sources of
7 funding: 1) general fund, 2) excess funds in Landowner Contingency account, and 3) support and
8 grants from the federal government. Heide stated he did not want legislature to just take the
9 excess dollars out of the Landowner Contingency Account for non-forestry, non-fire issues.
10 It’s not a continuing source and needs to be retained for landowner fire suppression.

11
12 Williamson commented that the Landowner Advisory Group is ok with using a portion of the
13 excess for specific projects. Small landowners might be interested in minor assessment (if
14 Landowner Contingency Fund were staying low, and funds were segregated) for forest health
15 services.

16
17 **Action: Peter Heide will integrate Mark Gray’s estimates of actual costs for parallel sorts of**
18 **employees.**

19
20 Denison advised there is a State responsibility. With most federal grants there’s at least 25
21 percent match.

22
23 Heide instructed that there is a State excise tax of five percent and four point two percent. It
24 would be difficult to take this money from counties because it’s used for vital services.

25
26 McElroy asked, “What’s the federal role?” There’s a declining interest in federal involvement in
27 assisting landowners in achieving landowner objectives. Example: Elimination of FIP and SIP,
28 reductions in FLEP. Today is probably the “high side”.

29
30 Moon added that the State legislature is only able to offer one point two percent of State budget to
31 Natural Resources.

32
33 Fonda stated another source of funding is the forest itself. Only if the forest can’t pay for itself,
34 would some of these other funding sources be needed.

35
36 Lippke repeated, “You can pay me now or you can pay me later”. What you are paying for now
37 for fire suppression costs could easily pay for lots of this work. If you could prevent fire, you can
38 save a lot of money. Focus on non-market values, even if you can’t remove fire suppression costs
39 immediately.

40
41 Saunders pointed out more state appropriations will buy down the cost of firefighting. RTI has
42 estimates of the savings, value of reducing firefighting costs. The TriData study addressed this.

43
44 McElroy advised the Journal of Forestry, Oct 2004 has an article regarding trying to estimate the
45 total cost of the Hayman Fire; including dredging Denver’s water reservoir. **McElroy can get**
46 **copies of the Journal if anyone wants to read the article.**

47
48 Lippke suggested getting a blue ribbon commission to decide how we should bring those non-
49 market values into consideration when funds are made available.

Williamson explained that non-integrated log producers pay “B&O Extractors tax”, which is half of one percent of the gross.

McElroy indicated there is a need for funds: 1) If there’s an emergency insect or disease situation, and don’t have an appropriation to take care of it, Landowner Contingency Fund? Emergency Firefighting Fund?) 2) If Tier 3 requires action, there must be a source of funds to pay for it; and expect repayment from the landowner.

Williamson asked why NRCS forest health activities don’t qualify for Centennial Clean Water Grant Programs.

Saunders replied that those grants have a very strict federal criterion, that must have a strong tie into water quality; and the amount of available money is shrinking.

Page 3; Line 12 add **Use federal grants for incentives.**

Forest Practices Rules and Impact to Forest Health – Steve Tveit

Tveit identified two areas where Forest Practice Rules have impact. The first is in dealing with rules that restrict the landowners from effectively treating the stand to improve its resistance to health threats or prevent landowners from taking action if stands are currently being impacted by health issue. These rules are the riparian zones restrictions and other leave areas that do not allow harvesting. Example: Spotted Owl circles. **Recommendation: The Forest Practices Board should review both these rule sets through adaptive management processes.**

The second is dealing with salvage and pesticide spraying in the process of obtaining permits. Tveit added the permit process could be lengthy when application for pesticide spraying is appealed. The other issues are timely salvage of wind thrown, fire damage, and killed trees. There has been an increase in appeals of applications needed to salvage trees. Private landowners have concerns over the appeal process, as it could cause delay of salvage, which could cause economic losses, and the potential for insect problems to increase. **Recommendation: Forest Practices Board should look into ways to include salvage and treatments of insect pests as emergency applications that would speed up the process and limit the appeal process.**

McElroy suggested that in our Report to the Legislature we include a paragraph that says, “Furthermore we recommend the Forest Practice Board look at...” and that after this the Committee send a letter to the Forest Practice Board highlighting this and our concerns.

Mankowski told Tveit that he thought the paper was good, that it lays out an appropriate intersection between the work of our group, forest health, and forest practices rules.

Task g: Develop recommendations for the proper treatment of infested and fire, and wind damaged forests on public and private lands within the context of working with interdisciplinary teams under the forest practices act to ensure that forest health is achieved with the protection of fish, wildlife, and other public resources. – Rich Fonda, Gary Berndt (DNR), and John St. Pierre

Fonda explained that St. Pierre has several documents from the Colville that could be attached as appendixes.

What’s the role of interdisciplinary teams? Page 1, Line 16 – gets ID teams in fast, but don’t make decision in haste. Consider this entry as an opportunity to create a healthy forest. The task drives the answer (Legislature wants a facilitation of salvage). Need to get data on the scope of

the problem. Stakeholder ID Teams need to get together really fast. We need to define scope, and try to make an estimate now.

Action: Ripley assemble list for beginning of the report.

Recommendation: Hold onto issues for data gap discussion.

Some of this is confusing because different landowner groups have different issues. ID Teams apply to forest practices on state and private lands; ID Teams are most often used on more complex application of those laws. SEPA applies to state lands. NEPA applies to federal lands.

Fill in amount of acres on Page 1, Line 7. (Denison: Washington ha 4-5 million acres of condition class II and III on National Forest system lands. Lippke: There are 4-5 million acres of overstocked stands.) **Don't limit comments to a specific landowner; get data.**

Mankowski asked how could we tie our solutions (Tier 1, 2, and 3) with an identification of the magnitude of the problem.

Williamson asked if the different types of ownerships, federal, state, and tribal define the scope of the problem on their own lands, but buy into the effort to fill the data gap for small private landowners.

Heide stated we should not be recommending a full-blown program that starts July 1, 2004. There needs to be some immediate backfilling to restore losses, but we can make a needs estimate to get started. Take some time to conduct a first round of assessments, and adjust over time.

Page 1, Line 21 should be **dead stands**, not dead trees.

Page 1, Line 25 use **crown**, not canopy; and after ecosystem insert: **Will not recover its photosynthetic capacity.**

Page 2, Line 14 insert after composition. **Important distinction coming:**

Page 2, Line 19 add after strategies, **and should be part of the decision making process.**

Page 3, Line 16 **Merge Tveit's report with this paragraph.**

Key Issues – Saunders

- Relative degree of specific regulatory oversight and responsibility (17.10 and 17.04 models?)
- Conditions for hazardous fuel, regardless of cause must be treated. **(Discuss tomorrow)**

Review Agenda for Tomorrow

- Task f: Cooperative Agreements
- Data Gaps and Opportunities
- Barry Moore – Presentation on Key Points for Riparian Forest Health Protection. Goals for Site Specific Planning, and Recommendation to FP Board
- Break into Groups to Improve Reports
- Lunch
- Report Back to Group on Fine Tuned Reports
- Look at Key Issues and Discuss

It was agreed to start tomorrow's meeting at 8:30 a.m., instead of 9:00 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00p.m.

DAY TWO

CALL TO ORDER:

Pat McElroy called the meeting to order at 8:42 a.m. Steve Saunders reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Task f: Cooperative Agreements – Karl Denison, Rick Brazell, and Maurice Williamson (Handouts: Example of Memorandum of understanding, and PowerPoint Presentation)

Williamson gave a little background on cooperative agreements

Brazell gave an explanation about cooperative agency status (CAS), and when it can be granted. 1) At the forest planning level (currently the Okanogan-Wenatchee, and the Colville National Forests are in a three to four year process to revise their forest plans); 2) In developing an EA or EIS on a federal project (counties, states, and tribes can already be on an ID Team).

Is there a way the forests can incorporate the states Strategic Forest Plan in their planning process?

Petersen: Fire weather – can purchase compatible data gathering and processing systems. Is this a way we can benefit Forest Health? Have compatible analysis and maps, etc.

McElroy advised as we look at the strategic plan, and examine the existing memoranda and agreements with the Forest Service to see if we can include forest health cooperation, add it or develop a new type of MOA or Cooperative Agreement to achieve forest health improvements. Do we have a regional fire protection agreement that might be able to be modified to be suitable? McElroy didn't think the investment of state time is worth it for CAS.

Brazell indicated there might be many other opportunities for agreements for consistent approaches between all federal land managing agencies and the state so we can have a consistent approach to forest health. Forest Service would love to have the resources/help with planning, but no one seems to have time to participate and help each other.

Williamson commented that CAS is very expensive and consumptive of time and resources; but it is important to have meaningful participation in the forest planning effort. Don't join every project effort.

Conclusions

- Working together is good
- All federal agencies and tribes should be at the table.

PNWCG is a model for the fire/regulatory portions of the agencies.

Thronson stated that we needed to represent the land management side; it's different then the fire people.

Heide supports the idea that the state forester needs support/staff for working on policy issues, to interface the strategic plan with tribal and federal ownerships. It's a useful, efficient way to spend their time, and then CAS could be pursued later. It's very important to be at the table when agencies that aren't state lands are making land management decisions. There's a lot of policy work to be done with those people.

1 **Recommendation: Additional policy support.**

2 Petersen stated if there are limited resources to hire staff, he'd rather have them in the field
3 working with region staff and small landowners to get them up to speed.
4

5 Denison informed the Work Group that the Forest Service gave DNR a grant for a state person to
6 participate/coordinate in community wildfire protection planning process, and to work with
7 communities and coordinate the various participating agencies.
8

9 Williamson said the need for outreach to small landowners is addressed in other places in the plan
10 and report. Cooperative Agreements are a pointed piece of the legislation. We should pursue it
11 until we know it won't be fruitful.
12

13 Fonda asked what other mechanisms are there for the state to influence management on federal
14 land.
15

16 McElroy replied that State has a "moral suasion", not a specific authority. Do you do it at policy
17 level with forest plans, or at local level with projects? This is a task DNR was given. Bottom
18 line is: we can provide the perspective of the state of WA to their efforts, and represent state's
19 broader interest.
20

21 Williamson explained there are two parts to NEPA (the policy part at the front and process part
22 that comes later). The policy part has been ignored. Current administration (Bush CEQ) is
23 encouraging input from state and local governments. When we ask for funding at the policy
24 level, use an adaptive management approach to how we can implement state's strategic plan and
25 coordinate at a policy level.
26

27 How much is needed? Depends on Forest Service needs.
28

29 Need to seek information from the federal agencies. How do we get the biggest bang for the
30 buck?
31

32 Coordination should be improved.
33

34 Don't define it in terms of a specific position.
35

36 McElroy pointed out the bottom line is: "The decision authority remains with the federal
37 agency." **Action: McElroy will write a section for the strategic plan and share it with the;**
38 **group before we leave Spokane.**
39

40 **Data Gaps and Opportunities Subcommittee – Bruce Lippke, Maurice Williamson, and**
41 **Peter Heide (handout)**

42 Lippke explained this was just a one pager of a sketchy outline of what we are learning and trying
43 to develop. There has not been any time for the committee to interact yet. Lippke went over the
44 sections on the paper: a) Course Filter Fire Maps, b) FIA/GIS Methodology, c) Fuels planning,
45 and d) Forester Field Support.
46

47 Lippke summarized the levels: a) Appears to be primarily useful in communicating the general
48 need, b) appears to provided sufficient data to support a formal warning system, c) appears to
49 provide support for the Forest Service response to the need, and d) Appears to provide the
50 capacity of local communities to respond if needed training opportunities and perhaps certified
51 forest health consultants are made available.

1 Lippke explained the subcommittee will be interviewing and researching these capabilities in
2 more detail in order to provide a recommendation on what the data needs are to support a warning
3 system and a satisfactory response system. Cost estimates of what it will take will be developed.
4

5 **Discussion**

6 McElroy commented on a new Pilot Program he thought Colorado was engaged in it now, it's
7 called the Spatial Analysis Project, (SAP) and covers the Southeast Region of the USA, (20
8 states). Forest Service, State and private forestry called us and wanted to know if we were
9 willing to get involved in it.

10
11 McElroy asked on "C", "Is that specific to national forestlands only?"
12

13 Lippke replied the tools could certainly be customized, but the effort was focused on national
14 forestlands.
15

16 Heide commented on "B", this looks like the kind of information that was planned with
17 identifying places where more effort is needed. What would it cost to make this happen in the
18 eastern region of the state?
19

20 Lippke explained Jeremy Fried has acted and worked on this for four years, can't tell you the
21 status of where he is with this; but he has been working on eastern Washington, and he doesn't
22 think its too far away. It will cost more money for more layers, but as the tools get better the
23 more useful it will become. This has the potential to do things you want it to do.
24

25 Heide asked do we have that information about Fred's work?
26

27 Ripley replied Fried gave a presentation at our July meeting in Spokane, and passed out handouts
28 at that time.
29

30 McElroy remembered the colored brochure that gave the Arizona example that focused on Bio
31 Sums, using FIA/GIS to base the modeling.
32

33 Heide pointed out that if we are going to do this, we should ask the legislature for money. We
34 have a timing problem. We need to figure out the cost if we are going to do this and get it to the
35 legislature. Can't wait till next year.
36

37 Lippke stated that out of all approaches this would give you your answers.
38

39 Petersen asked if it was compatible with Karen's annual insect and disease survey information?
40 Is it compatible with bringing it out to the local level for landowner information?
41

42 Lippke said this should be accessed on a system where you can go look at it. Is it right now?
43 Doesn't think it is. Would need to be incorporated into the system. Colville already has all this.
44

45 Ripley commented that Jeremy's system is flexible.
46

47 **Heide suggested asking Fried to come to next meeting.** Also suggested making a
48 recommendation to the legislature for funding.
49

50 Fonda commented, "This needs to be the answer to questions that are asked."
51

1 McElroy stated that we need to define the problem across the mainstream. The predominant use
2 for that information is to inform the legislature the nature and magnitude of the problem. The
3 next step would be to identify where the problem is. Then plan, and prioritize what needs to be
4 done. That is a different kind of information that we need to make those decisions. How do we
5 get it? Where is it available? What existing sources are there?

6
7 Heide said to get the information on forest stands, to see where the problems are.

8
9 Saunders pointed out there are three key issues: 1) What are the questions we are trying to
10 answer, 2) What information do we need to answer these questions, and 3) Gap analysis; what
11 information needs to be provided? Do we have a committee that can address this?

12
13 Lippke replied, "Yes."

14
15 McElroy advised that we don't need any more information to sell the legislature on that there is a
16 problem. We are at the operational level.

17
18 Fonda replied stand specific data. If we are not going to write prescriptions in this forest health
19 strategy situations because there are so many variables and so many different kinds of stands.
20 The reasoning that identified these different kinds of methods ought to be able to be applied to all
21 the stands.

22
23 Heide agreed, but won't be able to get stand level information for all over the state. It's too
24 expensive. Is there someone in DNR with this type of expertise?

25
26 McElroy replied, "I think that DNR folks who understand inventory are really focused on DNR
27 inventory that is used for a very specific purpose, not this kind of work." We may have some in-
28 house people, but I don't have a clue who they are.

29
30 Heide asked Thronson if he would have the time to help.

31
32 Thronson replied he would try and make the time to help.

33
34 **Tveit recommended the State coordinate with the feds and private landowners to put**
35 **something together.** It's just not a forest health database; we need other resources.

36
37 McElroy explained because of our role in Forest Practices, we do have a GIS system that has
38 General Land Office (GLO) information, roads, and state soil survey information. It's probably
39 pretty weak on federal lands. It's a regulatory sort of situation. How compatible that system is
40 with other systems, McElroy was not familiar. How to integrate all this is another matter.

41
42 Thronson added that Doretta Collins, in DNR - Forest Practice Division has a data layer. Heide
43 should contact her.

44
45 Heide mentioned there might be a potential for interface.

46
47 Petersen commented that it seems that this database is paralyzing this project. It's going to mire
48 us down. We need to screech this to a halt this morning, and really rethink this. How are we
49 going to get this stuff done on the ground? We've got to know what to do. If we wait around for
50 this to happen, this is going to paralyze us. Would rather take the approach where we focus on
51 field support from the bottom up.

1 Williamson disagrees with McElroy and Peterson. In regards to small landowners, the committee
2 I've worked on, one of its priorities is the need for a spatial explicit database regarding the small
3 landowner ownership. Williamson thinks whatever implementation we elect to promote under
4 the Strategic Plan, there is probably going to be a need for that type of information to help justify
5 what we are talking about and doing to the small landowners. Don't stop the project, just beef up
6 GIS and Strategic Plan, and not only implement them for forest health problems, but for other
7 problems as well.

8
9 Saunders emphasized if we can get a small committee together in the next three weeks to put
10 some additional information together by the next meeting, we might be able to move to the point
11 to put the information into the report. We need to identify what information is required to
12 carryout direction to the legislature. There are two levels: 1) General policy information, and 2)
13 Operational level, would need additional work to scope dollars that would provide the committee
14 something to finalize by the next meeting.

15 **Action: Committee to get more information by next meeting: Heide, Lippke, and Thronson.**

16
17 Brazell commented the Forest Service has spent millions and millions of dollars, and he is a little
18 bit leery of opening up more than forest health kind of stuff. You're talking about a huge
19 database. To expand across the state just boggles my mind.

20
21 Williamson elaborated that he goes out to people's places by invitation. Most of the stewardship
22 foresters go out by invitation. Never goes uninvited. In order to contact some of these people we
23 need information at Karen's level. We need to factor that in.

24
25 Ripley advised the information at her level is a map that says you have a problem.

26
27 Send a letter and a description of problem to get formal invite. Say you are working in the area
28 and hold a formal meeting.

29
30 Petersen stated that information would be the C&D category information; level B is not enough
31 information. His organization has gone to over 2,000 doors, with only one person who was mad
32 at us.

33 This tells me it is a viable way to do outreaches. It is pretty cheap; we haven't spent that much
34 money on it. If you are providing a free service, people are going to buy that.

35
36 Fonda added you need to remember this conversation when we get around to finalizing Tier1, 2,
37 and 3.

38
39 Saunders acknowledged what Fonda said, but indicated that we needed to move forward, and
40 trust the committee to go forth and come back with some good information for the next meeting.

41
42 Moon complimented the members of the Work Group. He said we were a very good working
43 group, and that he was very impressed. Moon recommended if we have any extra data, to use it
44 by putting it into an appendix. DNR will have an executive summary; most members will read
45 the entire report and make a decision. It's very important that the body of the report catches their
46 attention. Include (for appropriations) a need, the agency it goes to, and a cost figure. Tell
47 what's to be done and how much. No money, no program. Need to have a draft sent to me by
48 early December, as the Bill will be drafted by end of December. Finalize Bill by January 10th.
49 This is a top priority in the Senate; they will hear it the first week of the legislative session.

50 **Action: Need to send draft in e-mail to Vic Moon early December.**

1 **Key Points for Riparian Forest Health Protection. Goals for Site Specific Planning; and**
2 **Recommendations to Forest Practices Board – Barry Moore**

3 Moore opened by saying, “Forest health problems are associated with overcrowded stands which
4 are associated with aquatic function.” Two examples are: 1) Colville National Forest has
5 severely overcrowded stands, which result in catastrophic fires; 2) Clearwater National Forest in
6 Idaho has the same problem. These stands are also deficient in terms of wildlife for the animals
7 that traditionally inhabit them.

8
9 Traditional deciduous species have been replaced by dense coniferous upland vegetation. This
10 has changed the hydrologic function. When annual rainfall occurs as snow, the snow is retained
11 in the crowns and evaporates without making it to the forest floor; therefore there is a loss of
12 water quantity. Also conifers cause more evapotranspiration so there is a decrease in water
13 quantity.

14
15 Coniferous vegetation provides bark and needles, which support a different suite of organisms
16 than would live off the deciduous vegetation. There used to be a few big trees, but now there are
17 tons of small trees.

18
19 Many streams have loss of fisheries that previously were there. The most profound effect is the
20 1st to 4th order streams (small). As you have more widespread situation, the larger streams and
21 rivers are also affected.

22
23 **Impediments:**

24 Regulation’s that preclude entry and management, when management could achieve more
25 desirable conditions.

26
27 **Economic:**

28 CNF’s proposed doing active management; but the timber is not high value. Need alternative
29 markets and uses for those materials. Are economic impediments different on different
30 landowners?

31
32 **Political:**

33 Suspicion that “you’re just doing this to make money, etc.” is not valid. Real goal is to protect
34 water quality.

35
36 **Discussion**

37 Heide asked if there were any publications that document the situation? **Answer:** Yes. Impacts
38 on benthic invertebrates.

39
40 Williamson was sorry John St. Pierre was not in attendance. He pointed out there are a lot of big
41 drivers on rules: shade, bank stability, and large wood recruitment.

42
43 McElroy asked if conifers should be present in riparian areas.

44
45 Moore replied you want to have a change in vegetation at the stream...you would have Cornus,
46 Cretagus, and Alder.

47
48 Western streams are wider, and have higher width to depth ratio than eastern streams. Eastern
49 streams are being totally overwhelmed by the mass of small junk that’s coming in.

1 Petersen commented there have been three really large stand replacement fires in the last 20 years
2 in the Kettle range. Elevations have been greater than 4,000 ft. They were all natural fires.
3 They've been predominantly conifer riparian areas with some Cornus. He would like to see some
4 data. ICBMP said that the most intact areas for fisheries are higher elevations. Petersen thinks
5 it's the channel scouring events that are really damaging (associated with roads and big floods).
6 If we cut trees, then will have more consumption of water and will cause lower late season flows.
7 He agrees there may be a place to alter conifer/deciduous balance.

8
9 Moore advised don't assume that just because you protect the riparian vegetation, you've
10 protected the stream system. Need to restore the stream geomorphometry.

11
12 Lippke stated there are post hot fire, and run-off issues. Hotter fires make less infiltration, more
13 run-off and erosion. Scale is important influence on ability of system to recover. Are there
14 adjacent areas to repopulate the fish in this area?

15
16 Fonda asked if there was any information on monitoring streams after a hot fire.

17
18 McElroy recalled that in October's Journal of Forestry there might be an article.

19
20 Moore replied the George Ice papers from Coweeta at Hubbard Brook did some work. There is a
21 new book available now.

22
23 Gara asked if there was a change in macro invertebrates linked to fish.

24
25 Moore replied that he didn't study that. Took a baseline of whether changes in management
26 affected BMI. Management was not implemented.

27
28 Williamson stated that shade is a driver for managing stream temperature. What affects
29 temperature more? The exposure to sunlight, or upwelling relative to ambient air temperature?

30
31 Moore replied you would have to look at where the stream water was coming from.

32
33 Petersen asked if there was side-by-side stream system studies related to beaver...influence the
34 amount of deciduous presence in beaver sites. Is it also an influence with fire, roads, and past
35 channel damage?

36
37 Moore replied that Bob Neiman from the University of Washington did a study...sediments,
38 BMI.

39
40 Fonda asked if BMI shifting is based on food base changes. Is it just a shift balance, or new
41 community totally?

42
43 Moore replied, "It is all native species."

44
45 Saunders instructed if anyone has any sources or information to please share it with the group, by
46 putting it on paper and giving it to Karen.

47
48 McElroy asked Moore to write two or three paragraphs on the consequences of untreated forest
49 health conditions on watershed function. Include citations.

50
51 Denison asked Moore to please distinguish between elevation bands.

1 Moore replied he has not studied roadless areas.

2
3 **Ripley announced that it was now time to break into sub groups and strengthen our papers**
4 **based on comments received, strengthening linkage with fire/protection, strengthening the**
5 **link between healthy forests producing appropriate quantities of high water quality, and**
6 **watershed concepts.**

7
8 Saunders added that we would start the reports after lunch.

9
10 **Group 1: Tiers/76.06 RCW – Bob Gara and Rich Fonda**

11 Fonda explained they made major changes; they rearranged Lines 1-10 that dealt with exotic
12 insects. The second noxious weed law was moved to the end of the three tiers, on page three.
13 The fundamental description was still intact.

14
15 **Issues for decision:**

16 For legislation: Need to be able to articulate when an extreme health hazard exists. “Ought to
17 look like this” and let Bill drafters define it.
18 Page 3, Line 2 is a good definition. When you have one of these, you have a Science Advisory
19 Group (SAG) that evaluates the circumstances, advises the Commissioner to take action or not.
20 Is there a standing SAG or is it incident-specific? Incident –specific, created by Commissioner to
21 evaluate specific situation. Legislation describes the general make up of the committee.
22 Scientists with expertise, plus local landowner representative, plus etc. Page 3, Line 22 has
23 nebulous language, “Extreme forest health hazard could only occur following the appointment of
24 a SAG...Leading to a Commissioners’ forest health hazard order.”

25
26 **Group 2 Incentives, Barriers, and Opportunities – Bruce Lippke, Elaine Oneil, and Mike**
27 **Petersen**

28 Lippke advised they incorporated 70 percent of the comments.

29
30 Is it useful to identify who bears the costs and who gets the benefits? Group these elements by
31 who pays. It isn’t easy. Will try to do.

32
33 There are some placeholders for other wording from other reports.

34
35 Oneil stated there is a preamble for education and technical assistance: What are we trying to
36 educate others about? We need how to define when an extreme forest health hazard occurs.
37 Capture the data gaps.

38
39 It is now very detailed, could use some communication-easing improvements.

40
41 Oneil advised they are putting in the Tribal information.

42
43 Where does stuff dealing with community fire planning go? Stay here?

44
45 Fonda suggested looking at way to condense/classify the table information.

46
47 McElroy stated he would hate to lose it. Suggested capturing it in an appendix.

48
49 Lippke replied they would regroup. Today’s data information is more systematic.

50
51 McElroy would like the group to look at non-market values.

1 **Group 3: Forest Practices – Steve Tveit and Howard Thronson, and Rich Fonda**

2 Fonda made the changes suggested yesterday.

3
4 Thronson described areas of forest practices where changes could be considered: salvage after
5 large fires; altering Greenup rules; and landscape level firebreaks.

6
7 Tveit talked about the Greenup Rules and salvaging areas with spruce budworm.

8
9 Fonda asked how much do the riparian zones affect forest health issues?

10
11 Pat replied riparian zones are a big problem because of the rule complexity.

12
13 Tveit wants to encourage the development of fire resistant large trees.

14
15 Williamson addressed the scope of the problem, informing us that 12.2 percent of eastern
16 Washington forestlands are in riparian zones.

17
18 Fonda commented that if it is less than ten percent don't let riparian zones drive the process.

19
20 **Group 4: Funding – Pete Heide**

21 Heide stated they still needed to identify elements to pay for, and identify funding sources.

22
23 **Recommendations**

- 24 ○ Tier 1: DNR restore stewardship program to pre 2003 levels
25 ○ Utilize dollars from LOCF to support data gathering
26 ○ Develop the capacity for State Forester to have a policy level position to coordinate state
27 forest health strategy with respect to federal and tribal
28 ○ Forest Health coordinator to focus on areas at risk and develop regulatory mechanisms
29 ○ Funds to deal with emergency exotic insects and disease
30 ○ DNR strive to maintain USFS support for many programs
31 ○ DNR seek new funding where available to places targeted by Strategic Plan.
32 ○ SFLO communities explore self-taxing or fee structure to support forest health

33
34 Needs additional critical look when we have other reports.

35
36 Lippke stated that restoring stewardship wouldn't be enough to tackle much extra.

37
38 Heide explained that additional people would be phased in and the eastside would be restored for
39 Tier 1 right away.

40
41 McElroy stated, "We need to acknowledge and energize/fund cooperative extension for
42 information delivery."

43
44 Heide replied that they did include WSU.

45
46 **Group 5: Cooperative Agreements – Karl Denison, and Rick Brazell**

47 Denison explained the Legislation required the Commissioner of Public Lands to promote
48 communications between the state and the federal government regarding forest land management
49 decisions that potentially affect the health of forests in Washington and will allow the state to
50 have an influence on the management of federally owned land. This was recommended because

of the slow response by the Forest Service to rapidly address the increasing forest health crisis. The Legislation also required the USFS and BLM need to consider all.

Denison recommends the state create a new position to coordinate with federal land management agencies on the strategic plan. DNR would monitor.

Denison also made a suggestion that the state may want to intervene in legal challenges on projects that support the statewide healthy forest strategy.

The Committee recommends that the agencies review existing agreements and modify as necessary to incorporate state strategic forest health objectives.

Group 6: Strategic Plan – Pat McElroy

McElroy advised there were three general changes:

- Talked to Barry Moore about what watersheds did, and he provided the language for the desirable outcome.
 - Watersheds provide water in appropriate quantities, at appropriate times, and with adequate quality to sustain human and wildlife populations and to sustain aquatic ecosystems and their associated resources.
- Took out recommend changing the forest practice rules and put in a category called “Potentially conflicting laws and regulations”
 - Communicate with Forest Practices Board on issues identified by the Forest Health Strategy Work Group that may need study and evaluation by the Board through Adaptive Management or other means.
 - Evaluate the impact of Washington’s State Implementation Plan for the Clean Air Act, air quality regulations, and the state Smoke Management Plan on achieving fuels treatment and species composition and stocking goals related to forest health. Recommend changes necessary to achieve the goals of the Clean Air Act and the vision and desired outcomes of the State Strategic Plan for Forest Health.
- The last change is under federal land, in concert with what you’ve been doing here the real core here is to: Determine the most effective way the state can influence land management decisions on federal lands so that federal lands are managed in ways that achieve the vision and desired outcomes of state’s Strategic Plan for Forest Health.
- Identify processes that provide the greatest opportunity to achieve desired outcomes at a reasonable cost.
 - Examine existing agreements to determine if they can be suitably modified to achieve the desired outcome, or if they could provide a model if not suitable.
 - Evaluate the advantages and costs of Cooperating Agency Status “CAS” on Forest Service land, particularly in light of changing Forest Service land use planning processes.
 - Develop new agreements/processes as necessary.
 - Evaluate the advisability and consequences of intervening in appeals or other legal proceedings when an adverse outcome would frustrate the intent of the Strategic Plan.

Denison suggested adding: **Monitor federal success**

McElroy pointed out much of what fleshes out of the report will go into the strategic plan.

Key Issues for Decision

- Relative degree of specific regulatory oversight and responsibility (Must address it in next draft)

1 ○ Conditions for hazardous fuel, regardless of cause must be treated. Must conditions of
2 hazardous fuel, regardless of cause, be treated?
3
4 Want to see the wording context for how Tier 3 is presented to legislature.
5 **Action: Ripley and McElroy will put something together for next group.**
6
7 76.04.660 requires landowner or person responsible for an extreme fire hazard to x, abate, or y....
8 Are you assuming a liability or is someone coming after you with a hammer?
9 Tveit wants to read the description.
10
11 Ripley read the description. Do you like the definition in the body of the document we saw?
12
13 McElroy added that substantial risk of insect and disease activity, watershed function will be
14 affected, risk of catastrophic fire substantially increases ... look at desired future condition and
15 describe that SAG will make a determination whether that has occurred.
16
17 Heide pointed out that it conflicts with need to have a standard/metric when start to influence
18 people's liability.
19
20 Tveit stated that we need to provide metrics that will guide SAG.
21
22 Petersen added need to have a trigger for Tier 3 that's much more rigorous than the Tier 2
23 determination.
24
25 Saunders explained that we needed to have a threshold to trigger convening of the SAG, and
26 metrics to guide them. (Maybe put metrics in an appendix.)
27
28 Lippke added metrics of forest fire model: crown fire index as hi, mod, low
29 Metrics of density for risk for bark beetle activity.
30
31 Denison said we should clarify that notification will occur.
32 Does liability occur right when situation comes?
33 Punitive action only occurs after ignored notification and Tier 2 process. Tier 3 is a significant
34 threat.
35
36 Heide stated failure to exercise responsibility to manage the land is not natural. Liability is the
37 incentive to bring them to the voluntary table.
38
39 Brazell: People who are out of state and/or clueless, will be a problem. Also, the Forest Service
40 can trade goods for services. Value of good stuff is traded for taking the small stuff too. DNR
41 keep list of who knows what to do...Service providers want to get on list. Certification.
42
43 Williamson: When there's no way to retrieve any money from the action, you are unlikely to get
44 action. Can we construct something like family culvert replacement? If you are willing to do a
45 plan, get put on a list for grant money ... within x years it can be fixed.
46
47 Heide: Must call it a nuisance. Even if folks can't act, trigger liability immediately.
48
49 6. Fire patrol assessment
50 Most land currently assessed at <\$100 per acre. If did fair market assessment, would
51 be \$600 to \$800. Would really increase assessments. Threaten to change forest

1 designation if they don't manage in accordance with DNR's standards. ...

2
3 Petersen: Has timber management plan that helps him keep his forestland designation. Could we
4 influence that there needs to be a fifth element of those plans?

5
6 McElroy advised to be careful incentive doesn't drive folks to take forestland out of designation.

7
8 If person fails to take required action, falls under absolute liability and/or is assessed an additional
9 Landowner contingency fund fee to alleviate impact of your nuisance on your neighbors. Could
10 also be forest patrol assessment fee?

11
12 Williamson asked, "How to calibrate what that fee increase should be? Base it on necessary
13 suppression costs?"

14
15 McElroy asked what the penalty should be for being in Tier 3 and not doing what you are told to
16 do.

17
18 Liability starts when structural situation starts.

19
20 Fee starts after notification; etc., occurs and is not heeded.

21
22 **Saunders suggested laying out pros and cons of potential fee or even a different fee for**
23 **forest health.**

24
25 **Next Steps**

- 26 ○ Reports to Karen by October 22nd, including Data Gap Report, (Pat and Karen may put these
27 items in different places of report.
28 ○ Karen compiles draft report, and sends out to Committee for review by November 4th
29 ○ At next meeting, review comments and incorporate into final draft
30 ○ Check for new location for November Meeting (**Vicki will check and get new location**
31 **information out to the members and the stakeholders**)
32 ○ Karen and Pat unify

33
34 **Next Meeting**

- 35 ○ Review report so an agreement can be reached and the report can be turned over to a
36 technical editor.

37
38 **December 21st, Meeting**

- 39 ○ View final form of report, and make minor typo changes
40 ○ View budget numbers
41 ○ View draft legislation
42 ○ View DNR's Strategic Plan

43
44 Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

45
46 The next meeting will be November 9th, at Olympic National Forest Supervisor's Office, 1835
47 Black Lake Blvd. SW, STE A, Olympia, Washington. Meeting will start at 9:00 a.m.